DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 402 841 HE 029 758

AUTHOR Pisani, Anoush M.; Stott, Nathan
TITLE An Investigation of Part-Time Faculty Commitment to Student Development. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE Nov 96
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (Memphis, TN, October 31 - November 3, 1996).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Advising; Attitude Measures; Developmental Programs; *Faculty Advisers; Guidance Programs; Higher Education; *Interaction Process Analysis; *Part Time Faculty; Predictive Measurement; *Regression (Statistics); Student Adjustment; Student Development; *Student Personnel Services
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting

ABSTRACT

This study examined the factors influencing the commitment of part-time faculty to developmental advising. The study was based on a theoretical framework which suggests that developmental advising is a learning experience that involves interaction of students and faculty members. The data for the study were collected during a 1992 survey of 969 part-time faculty (504 responses) at a midwestern university, with variables characterized as descriptive or attitudinal. The study found that the greatest positive influence on developmental advising was integration of part-time faculty into the department. It was concluded that increasing faculty involvement in developmental advising will enhance the quality of higher education. Variable definitions and scale rankings are defined in the appendix, and results are analyzed and then summarized in two tables, one a correlation matrix and the other listing the regression coefficients. (Contains approximately 55 references.) (CH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 402 841

An Investigation of Part-Time Faculty Commitment to Student Development

Anoush M. Pisani
DePaul University
Institutional Planning and Research
25 East Jackson Boulevard
Lewis Center, Room 1300
Chicago, Il 60604-2287
E-mail: apisani@wppost.depaul.edu

Nathan Stott
DePaul University
Institutional Planning and Research
25 East Jackson Boulevard
Lewis Center, Room 1300
Chicago, Il 60604-2287
E-mail: nstott@wppost.depaul.edu

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Paper presented the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Memphis, November 1996.

HE 029 754

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ASHE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ASHE

ASSOCIATION
FOR THE
STUDY OF
HIGHER EDUCATION

Texas A&M University
Department of Educational
Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held in Memphis, Tennessee, October 31 - November 3, 1996. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

Abstract

Part-time faculty can make substantial contributions to institutions because they represent a flexible resource that allows the institution to respond more effectively to the environment. An area of concern is whether the part-time status imparts a level of commitment to teaching that undermines educational quality. This study examines the teaching commitment of part-time faculty by considering their efforts at developmental advising.

An Investigation of Part-Time Faculty Commitment to Student Development

Part-time faculty have become an integral fixture in the academic community, comprising more than thirty-five percent of the higher education teaching faculty in the United States. The National Center for Educational Statistics estimates that 270,000 part-time faculty are teaching in institutions of higher learning. Given the economic hardships higher education is currently facing, it seems highly unlikely that institutions will significantly reduce their utilization of temporarily assigned part-time faculty. Unfortunately, the utilization of part-time faculty has not been embraced by all members of the academic community.

The controversy surrounding the utilization of part-time faculty stems, in part, from the national concern about the overall quality of teaching occurring in post-secondary education. Part-time faculty have been particularly lambasted since the issuance of several prominent reports in the mid-to-late 1980s. One such report, *Involvement in Learning* (National Institute of Education, 1984), cites the inability of part-time faculty to make a primary commitment to the college or university and asserts that such a commitment underlies the ability of faculty to create conditions for effective learning. In 1988, the National Education Association (NEA) issued *Report and Recommendations on Part-Time, Temporary, and Nontenure Track Faculty Appointments*. This publication advocates reducing the number of part-time and temporary faculty due to the negative impact of such appointments and expresses concern that fiscal and administrative imperatives may drive institutions to use more part-time faculty than is educationally sound (p. 12).

Paradoxically, very little empirical evidence has been amassed to substantiate the contention that part-time faculty have a negative impact on educational quality. Gappa and Leslie (1993) found that part-time faculty vary widely in their teaching performance, but no evidence exists to suggest that they are at the root of any systemic decline in the quality of higher education. They further found that part-time faculty were, for the most part, qualified for their teaching assignments, highly committed, and conscientious about doing their jobs.

Evaluating educational quality in institutions of higher learning is a massive undertaking, even when focusing solely on the efforts of part-time faculty. Since the learning environment in post-secondary education consists of both in-class and out-of-class experiences, the scope of student learning and development greatly exceeds that which is measurable by academic achievement tests or student evaluations of faculty. In order to manageably evaluate educational quality, it becomes necessary to break-down integral components of the higher learning experience.

One component of higher education that is frequently criticized is student advising (National Institute of Education, 1984; Boyer, 1987). *Involvement in Learning* (1984), which took issue with the use of part-time faculty, identified advising as "one of the weakest links in the education of college students" (p. 31). Frost (1991, p. 16) defines advising as a process which focuses attention on students' interaction with the enterprise of higher education and not simply on courses of study. Advising can stimulate growth and development by encouraging students to use the cognitive and affective domains in their educational inquiry (Carberry, Baker, and Prescott, 1986; Ender, Winston, and Miller, 1982; Frost, 1989a, 1989b, 1990, 1991; Gordon, 1988; Habley and Crockett, 1988; Thomas and Chickering, 1984). Given the effect advising imparts on student growth, it seems plausible, then, to examine the commitment of part-time faculty toward developmental advising.

Our premise is rooted in developmental theory and maintains that advising is a component of learning experience since it involves the interaction of both the student and faculty member within

the context of higher education. The objective in undertaking this study is to expand the research on part-time faculty with respect to their contributions to educational quality by focusing in on the dimension of teaching known as developmental advising.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Historically, the purpose of student advising was to supply answers to specific course-related questions, but to circumvent any discussion of broad-based academic issues (Crookston, 1972; Gordon, 1988). By the early 1970s, the role of advising in higher education became more meaningful as theorists linked student-advisor interactions with the learning process (Crookston, 1972; Frost, 1991). The enhanced perspective of the student-advisor relationship was termed developmental advising.

The concept of developmental advising arose from the belief "The student should not be a passive receptacle of knowledge, but should share the responsibility for learning with the teacher" (Crookston, 1972, p. 12). Proponents of this enhanced perception of student advising suggest that this process enables greater attention to be directed to developmental objectives (Habley, 1988). For example, larger educational issues could be addressed such as acquiring content versus memorizing methodology, procuring an education versus obtaining a credential, or focusing on generalization versus specialization (Mahoney, 1982). Embracing the developmental approach was thought to provide continuity to the student's educational experience (Mash, 1978; Raskin, 1979; Borgard, 1981; Habley, 1981; Shane, 1981; Trombley and Holmes, 1981; Walsh, 1981; Winston, Ender, and Miller, 1982; Winston et al., 1984; Frost, 1991).

Developmental advising provides students and faculty with out-of-class contact for discussions on course work, career concerns, and values (Backhus, 1989; Beasley-Fielstein, 1986; Terenzini, Pascarella, and Lorang, 1982). These informal interactions have been associated with positive outcomes in student educational aspirations, attitudes toward college, academic achievement, intellectual and personal development, involvement, academic and social integration, motivation, satisfaction with educational quality, and persistence (Pascarella, 1980; 1985; Pascarella and Terenzini, 1978, 1980, 1981; Sagaria, Higginson, and White, 1980; Terenzini, Theophilides, and Lorang, 1984; Okun et al., 1986; Tinto, 1987; Stage, 1989; Frost, 1991). While inadequate advising has been shown to be a significant factor in the decision to leave college, positive attitudes of faculty seems to be one of the strongest contributors to students' success (Astin, Korn, and Green, 1987; Beal and Noel, 1980; Tinto, 1987).

Faculty efforts at developmental advising may vary due to inherent differences between disciplines. Academic disciplines differ in terms of the state of their knowledge base (Lodahl & Gordon, 1972; Gordon & Neumann, 1979; Neumann, 1979; Neumann & Neumann, 1983), their socialization processes (Bess, 1978), and characteristics of subject matter (Biglan, 1973; Creswell, Seagen, and Henry, 1979). Following various empirical investigations of organizational behavior across disciplines, the most useful distinctions among fields were found between hard and soft sciences (Lodahl & Gordon, 1972; Biglan, 1973; Creswell, Seagen, and Henry, 1979; Gordon & Neumann, 1979; Neumann, 1979; Neumann & Neumann, 1983, 1984) and between pure and applied fields (Biglan, 1973; Creswell, Seagen, and Henry, 1979, Neumann & Neumann, 1983; Neumann & Finaly, 1988). Consequently, the levels of faculty commitment toward developmental advising may indeed differ between hard and soft fields and between pure and applied departments (Neumann & Finaly-Neumann, 1990).

In addition to discipline differences, part-time faculty are not a homogenous group due to their reasons for seeking employment, their faculty roles, or their career aspirations (Gappa,1984). Because of their heterogeneity, characterizing part-time faculty is difficult. Tuckman and associates (1978) utilized the results of a survey of 3,763 respondents to develop a taxonomy of faculty based on their reasons for choosing part-time employment. This taxonomy contains seven categories: Semi-Retireds, Graduate Students, Hopeful Full-Timers, Full-Mooners, Homeworkers, Part-Mooners, and Part-Unknowners. Tuckman's typology continues to provide a foundation for examining part-time faculty employment experiences.

RESEARCH QUESTION

The theoretical framework presents evidence to support the importance of developmental advising in the educational process. The extent to which faculty partake in developmental advising may be varied across individual background differences. This study was undertaken to address the following question: *What factors influence the part-time faculty's commitment to developmental advising?*

METHODOLOGY

Data Source

The institutional data utilized in the analysis was collected during a 1992 survey administration. The instrument was developed by the Office of Institutional Planning and Research in consultation with the President, Provost, and Faculty Council for the identification of issues concerning part-time faculty. Because many courses are offered on a two-year cycle, the sample included all faculty who taught part-time in either 1990-91 or 1991-92. The survey was distributed to 969 part-time faculty through campus mail, with follow-up calls and reminders mailed to non-respondents. 504 surveys were returned for a response rate of 52%.

Variables

The purpose of the study was to examine the effects of descriptive (*race, gender, discipline typology, occupational typology, instruction level, number of courses taught in an academic year* and *years of service*) and attitudinal variables (*teaching desire, the quality of students, importance of pay, integration into the department*, and *satisfaction with the teaching support facilities*) have on developmental advising. The *discipline typologies* consisted of *Soft-Applied, Soft-Pure, Hard-Applied, and Hard-Pure* classifications. The *occupational typologies* were represented with six categories: *Semi-Retireds, Graduate Students, Hopeful Full-Timers, Full-Time Moonlighters, Homeworkers, and Artistic Moonlighters* (see Appendix for detailed definitions). The *instruction level* differentiated whether the part-time faculty taught primarily graduate or undergraduate level courses. The *number of courses taught in an academic year* was put into a standardized form or *z*-score (the number of standard deviations the value is away from the mean). This was done to account for differences in the way courses are defined by the respective colleges (LA&S, Commerce, Education, Theatre, Music, Law, and the School for New Learning - non-traditional adult learning program). The dependent variable (*developmental advising*) and five of the independent variables (*teaching desire, the quality of students, importance of pay, integration into the department, and satisfaction with the teaching support facilities* were represented by constructs comprised by using a reliability analysis of item means (see Appendix).

Data Analyses

An ordinary least squares regression was used to estimate the effects of the descriptive and attitudinal variables on developmental advising. Variables were entered in two blocks to separate the unique contributions of the control variables from the variables of interest. *Discipline typology, instruction level,* and the *number of courses taught in an academic year* were entered in to control for differences in the broad range of part-time faculty backgrounds (Pedhazur, 1982). The increased difficulty of some disciplines, especially in certain courses, may necessitate heightened developmental advising. The same reasoning may be applied to *instruction level* differences. Undergraduates may require more or less developmental advising than graduate students due to class sizes or other characteristics intrinsic to introductory and advanced-level educational experiences. Finally, the *number of courses taught in an academic year* may influence how a part-time faculty reports his/her time spent on developmental advising. If a part-time faculty member teaches more courses than his/her colleagues, he/she may be inclined to report extended time spent advising because of the additional responsibilities. Thus, the data was entered in two different blocks, one to control for the heterogeneity of the sample and the other to estimate the effects of the relevant variables on developmental advising.

The effects of the *number of courses taught in an academic year, years of service, teaching desire, quality of students, integration into the department,* and *satisfaction with the teaching support facilities* were hypothesized to have a positive impact on developmental advising. Listing *pay* as one of the top three reasons for part-time teaching was expected to have a negative impact on developmental advising. The effects of *race, gender, discipline typology, occupation typology,* and *instruction level* were unknown and hence a two tailed t-test was used because of the lack of a hypothesized direction for impacting developmental advising.

The problems of most concern in this analysis were those of heteroskedasticity, impure multicollinerarity, and omitted variables. Heteroskedascity is the violation of Classical Assumption V which states that observations of the error term are drawn from a distribution that has a constant variance. The larger the disparity between the size of observations in a sample, the larger the likelihood that the error term observations associated with them will have different variances and therefore be heteroskedastic (Studenmund, 1992). A plot of *years of service* and the *number of courses taught in an academic year* with the residuals of the regression identified these as two proportionality factors that could potentially cause heteroskedasticity. A Park test, which checks for heteroskedasticity by regressing the natural log of the squared residuals with the natural log of a proportionality factor and tests to see if the natural log of the proportionality factor is significant at the .01 level using the standard regression t-test, was used (Park, 1966). Neither proportionality factor was significant at the .01 level. Since two proportionality factors were discovered, a White test was run which tests whether or not two or more proportionality factors cause heteroskedasticity simultaneously (White, 1980). The White test is run by taking the squared residuals of the original equation less any dummy variables as the dependent variable and all the original independent variables less any dummy variables plus the square and cross products of the original independent variables as the independent variable (Studenmund, 1992). To test whether or not the independent variables are causing heteroskedasticity a chi-square test is used on nR^2 (sample size times unadjusted R^2) at the .01 level with degrees of freedom equal to the number of estimated coefficients in the equation. The White test also came up insignificant at the .01 level. The analyses indicated that heteroskedasticity was not a significant problem in the model.

The next problem considered was that of multicollinearity. Multicollinearity is the violation of the Classical Assumption VI which states that no independent variable is a perfect linear function of

one or more other independent variables. The more highly correlated two or more independent variables are, the more difficult it becomes to accurately estimate the coefficients of the true model. We are less concerned with the existence of multicollinearity than we are the severity of the association. If two variables move identically, then there is little chance that their individual impacts can be distinguished. However, if the variables are only roughly correlated, then we still might be able to estimate the two impacts accurately for most purposes (Studenmund, 1992). In the model, multicollinearity was encountered between *integration into the department* and *satisfaction with the university*. A significant zero order correlation of .6114 caused problems with the regression estimate ($p<.01$). While both variables were significant, *satisfaction with the university* had a negative sign. This can be expected in the presence of multicollinearity due to increased distribution of the estimated beta's. It was decided that part-time faculty do not have enough interaction with other university areas for them to distinguish between satisfaction with their respective departments and *satisfaction with the university*. Hence, the overall *satisfaction with the university* scale was dropped from the analysis. Another significant ($p<.01$) high simple correlation coefficient was between *integration into the department* and the and *satisfaction with the teaching support facilities* (.4929). However, the expected signs and level of importance of these items did not change and both variables were significant. Thus, it was decided to accept the increased variance of the two variables because of their theoretical importance to the analysis. Finally, variance inflation factors were computed by taking each independent variable as a dependent variable and regressing it on the rest of the independent variables. This analysis, unlike simple correlation coefficient testing, checks whether or not there is a high correlation between one independent variable and all other independent variables by estimating how much multicollinearity has increased the variance of an estimated coefficient. A value of five or higher is a good indicator for severe multicollinearity (Studenmund, 1992). $1/(1-R^2)$ was calculated for each equation and all variance inflation factor values were below five ruling out the problem of severe multicollinearity.

Due to the lack of literature on part-time faculty related to developmental advising and a somewhat low R^2, a completely specified equation in which all theoretically relevant variables are accounted for is difficult to determine. The Ramsey Regression Specification Error test (RESET) was used to check for specification bias and the improper usage of a functional form (Ramsey, 1969). The Ramsey RESET tests whether the addition of the predicted or estimated dependent variable to the second, third, and/or fourth power can significantly improve the overall fit of the equation. The F-test is used to test the hypothesis that the coefficients of the additional variables are not significantly different than zero (Studenmund, 1992). The Ramsey RESET was not significant at the .05 level using various combinations of powers of the predicted dependent variable. The results of the Ramsey Reset test make us more confident in the specification and functional form of the model.

RESULTS

The first block controlled for the differences in levels of advising intrinsic to *discipline typology*, *instruction level*, and the *number of courses taught in an academic year*. The effects of these variables were partialed out from the overall R^2 to show how much of the variance was explained by the variables of interest. *Hard-Pure* disciplines seemed to advise less than *Soft-Applied* disciplines. *Soft-Pure* and *Hard-Applied* disciplines had no significant differences compared with *Soft-Applied* disciplines. The *instruction level* (graduate or undergraduate) of part-time faculty influenced their developmental advising. Part-time faculty who taught primarily *graduate* courses contributed less time to developmental advising than instructors who taught primarily *undergraduate* courses. While these results may suggest the need for a separate analysis based on level and discipline, the lack of sufficient cases among different categories makes this type of analysis difficult. The R^2 for

this block explained 11.4% (10.3% adjusted R^2) of the variation in the dependent variable developmental advising with a significant F of 10.716.

The second block entered consisted of *race* (*minority/non-minority*), *gender*, *occupational typology*, *instruction level*, *years of service*, *teaching desire*, *the quality of students*, *importance of pay*, *integration into the department*, and *satisfaction with the teaching support facilities*. The R^2 for this block was increased to 24.2% an increase of 12.8% points with a significant F of 5.24. The adjusted R^2 went from 10.3% to 20.8%. Amemia's Prediction Criterion (1980) is a method of comparing alternative specification by adjusting the residual sum of squares for the sample size and the number of explanatory variables. [PC= RSS * (n+K)/(n-K) where n = sample size and K = the number of variables in the model less the constant.] Amemia's PC is a good estimate of the mean square error of a specified model which is a specification selection criterion that allows a tradeoff between bias and variance. Thus, Amemiya's PC lets you know if the reduction in bias caused by additional variables outweighs the increase in variance caused by additional variables. If all other factors such as theoretical relevance are equal, the model with the smallest Amemiya's PC is the better specification. Amemiya's PC for the first block was .911 and decreased to .829 for the second block, indicating a better specification with this addition to the model.

Integration into the department was a significant predictor at the .01 level. It had the positive hypothesized sign which indicates there is an increase in developmental advising with higher ratings of *integration into the department*. This variable also had the largest impact on developmental advising with a standardized coefficient of .176 and a partial correlation coefficient of .164. *Gender* was a significant variable ($p<.01$) which indicated that *females* were more likely to spend time in developmental advising. Being *female* had the second largest impact on developmental advising with a standardized regression coefficient of .158 and a partial correlation coefficient (the linear effect of x on y when the linear effects of other independent variables have been removed from both x and y) of .166. *Teaching desire* had the third largest impact on developmental advising ($p<.05$) with a standardized regression coefficient of .085 and a partial correlation of .086. A part-time faculty member's *satisfaction with the teaching support facilities* also had a significant positive impact on developmental advising ($p<.1$). With a standardized regression coefficient of .085 and a partial correlation coefficient of .076, *satisfaction with the teaching support facilities* is the fourth most important variable positively influencing developmental advising. The *quality of students* scale had the fifth largest significant standardized regression coefficient ($p<.1$) of .081 and a partial correlation coefficient of .081. The impact was positive indicating an increased level of developmental advising with a better perception of student quality. *Years of service* also had a significant impact on developmental advising ($p<.05$). The longer the part-time faculty member was associated with the institution, the greater the frequency of developmental advising. The standardized regression coefficient (.076) indicates that *years of service* has the sixth largest positive impact on developmental advising with a partial correlation coefficient of .083.

Part-time faculty members who were *Graduate Students* tended to advise less than *Full-Time Moonlighters* ($p<.05$). All other *occupational types* of part-time faculty (*Semi-Retireds, Hopeful Full-Timers, Homeworkers, and Artistic Moonlighters*) did not significantly differ in developmental advising when compared to *Full-Time Moonlighters*. Being a *Graduate Student* had the largest significant ($p<.01$) negative impact on developmental advising in the model with a standardized regression coefficient of -.108 and a partial correlation coefficient of -.110. *Race*, as defined by *minority/non-minority* classifications, did not have a significant contribution to developmental advising. *Minorities*, as a whole, were not more or less likely to advise *than non-minorities*. This

finding says little about individual differences between racial classifications which would be difficult to estimate due to an insufficient n in the sample.

DISCUSSION

Part-time faculty can make substantial contributions to institutions because they represent a flexible resource that allows the institution to respond more effectively to the environment. For example, part-time faculty do not cost the institution as much as full-time faculty, and, therefore, can be utilized to keep class sections small which research has shown is conducive to the learning process. Moreover, part-time faculty can add a practitioner-based dimension to professional instruction which is essential for institutions serving the career-oriented markets. The issue, of course, is whether the part-time status imparts an inadequate level of commitment to teaching thereby undermining educational quality. This study was undertaken to explore institutional part-time faculty commitment to the learning process within the context of developmental advising.

Developmental advising facilitates interaction, behavioral awareness, and problem-solving, decision-making, and evaluation skills (Crookston, 1972). Based upon the growth in both cognitive and non-cognitive areas, advising assumes a function of teaching within the developmental framework (Frost, 1991). Since developmental advising requires contact with faculty beyond traditional classroom exchanges, the enhanced interaction may enable students to become more integrated in the learning environment. The greater the extent to which the student is integrated into the learning environment, the easier it will be for them to assimilate common educational objectives.

Interestingly, the results of this research indicated that integration into the department had the greatest positive influence on part-time faculty engagement in developmental advising. Perhaps the enhanced interaction between members of the academic unit enables part-time faculty to assimilate shared departmental teaching objectives and instructional strategies. Integration into the department may provide part-time faculty with a knowledge base that allows them to be more comfortable and confident in offering advice to students.

Part-time faculty themselves may benefit from developmental advising with respect to their teaching aspirations by drawing from the institutional pool of experience. The findings from this study support the premise that years of service positively impact the extent to which a part-time faculty member engages in developmental advising. Collegial advising in the context of novice faculty orientation can be undertaken by more experienced part-time or full-time faculty in order to educate those new to the complexities of teaching. Institutions can link up part-time faculty members with either full-time or more experienced part-time as an orientation process. The increased contact between experienced and inexperienced faculty may, in turn, strengthen teaching desire.

One would expect a positive association between teaching desire and a faculty member's engagement in developmental advising. Indeed, the results of the study supported this contention. However, limitations in the data preclude a more qualitative definition of this variable. Teaching desire was defined by the likelihood that a part-time faculty member would accept full-time employment instructing in an institution of higher education. This definition restricts the consideration of teaching desire held by part-time faculty who want to continue their full-time pursuits. Thus, the impact of teaching desire may be under-estimated in this analysis.

Just as the goal of developmental advising is to heighten students' involvement in educational processes, efforts can be made to increase part-time faculty involvement with the teaching experience and hopefully enhance their instructional practices. The findings from this study suggest that graduate students are less inclined to advise than other part-time faculty. This may be due to their lack of teaching desire, since part-time instruction may be more of a stipend requirement for graduate students than an active pursuit. However, graduate students have dual roles in an institution and may need to be integrated into the department as teachers as well as learners. Integrating graduate students in the department as part-time faculty may increase their teaching involvement and benefit their future academic careers.

Quite simply, concern shown by the university for part-time faculty as individuals may transfer into their classrooms and influence their teaching desire and overall satisfaction. Possessing a strong teaching desire should be a fundamental criterion for part-time faculty who do not have the same obligations of full-time faculty in terms of research and service. Institutions can encourage the teaching desire of part-time faculty by providing adequate support facilities. Our research has suggested that a part-time faculty member's satisfaction with teaching support facilities impacts his/her developmental advising practices.

The primary function of part-time faculty is teaching, and developmental advising is a corollary in the process of educating students. Much can be done to motivate part-time faculty to assume the advising function. Although these initiatives require time and effort, they support the institutional mission of providing consistent educational quality regardless of the temporal status of the faculty member. Determining methods to influence part-time faculty involvement in developmental advising can have significant benefits in enhancing the quality of higher education. However, the evidence realized from this study encompasses only one step toward evaluating the overall impact of part-time faculty. Further research must be conducted to ascertain whether the perceived disparities between full-time and part-time faculty and their impact on educational quality are indeed a reality.

TABLE I

Correlation Matrix

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.	15.	16.	17.	18.
1. Gender- Female	1	-.0138	.1668**	-.1405**	-.0425	.0389	.1935**	.0446	.0556	-.0580	-.1245**	-.0536	-.0590	-.0173	.1427**	.0088	.0948*	.1202**
2. Minority Status - Non Minority	-.0138	1	.0010	-.0035	.0150	-.0143	-.0584	.0176	.0167	-.0326	.0081	-.0451	-.0917*	-.0316	.1209**	-.0335	.0450	-.0550
3. Soft Pure Discipline	.1668**	.0010	1	-.1265**	-.1080*	.2542**	.3537**	.3353**	-.1844**	-.0170	-.3518**	.0438	-.0820	.1830**	.2052**	.0683	-.1931**	.2619**
4. Hard Applied Discipline	-.1405**	-.0035	-.1265**	1	-.0591	-.0506	-.0550	-.0403	-.1091*	-.0619	.0393	.0429	.0100	.0323	.0212	-.0296	-.0073	.0572
5. Hard Pure Discipline	-.0425	.0150	-.1080*	-.0591	1	-.0432	-.0470	-.0494	-.0931*	.2106**	-.0689	.0099	.0584	-.0567	-.0152	.0930*	-.0486	.1223**
6. Graduate Students	.0389	-.0143	.2542**	-.0506	-.0432	1	-.0403	-.0704	-.0783	-.0451	-.1601**	-.0146	-.0200	.0929*	.1016*	.0523	-.1168**	.1249**
7. Homeworkers	.1935**	-.0584	.3537**	-.0550	-.0470	-.0403	1	-.0763	-.0848	-.0488	-.1518**	.0632	.0388	.0695	.0734	.0583	-.0853	.1134*
8. Hopeful Full-Timers	.0446	.0176	.3353**	-.0403	-.0494	-.0704	-.0763	1	-.1481**	-.0853	-.2229**	.0461	-.1045*	.1145*	.3591**	.0376	-.1443**	.0837
9. Artistic Moonlighters	.0556	.0167	-.1844**	-.1091*	-.0931*	-.0783	-.0848	-.1481**	1	-.0949*	-.2440**	-.0166	.0308	.1076*	.0306	.1418**	.0523	.1048*
10. Semi-Retireds	-.0580	-.0326	-.0170	-.0619	.2106**	-.0451	-.0488	-.0853	-.0949*	1	.0047	.0295	.0419	-.0467	-.1034*	.0810	.0284	.0799
11. Instr. Level - Graduate	-.1245**	.0081	-.3518**	.0393	-.0689	-.1601**	-.1518**	-.2229**	-.2440**	.0047	1	-.0643	.0294	-.2109**	-.2481**	-.1795**	.1563**	-.3294**
12. Number of Courses Taught	-.0536	-.0451	.0438	.0429	.0099	-.0146	.0632	.0461	-.0166	.0295	-.0643	1	.1401**	.0101	.0562	.1705**	.0368	.0848
13. Years Of Service	-.0590	-.0917*	-.0820	.0100	.0584	-.0200	.0388	-.1045*	.0308	.0419	.0294	.1401**	1	-.0607	-.0558	.1269**	-.0648	.0406
14. Importance of Pay	-.0173	-.0316	.1830**	.0323	-.0567	.0929*	.0695	.1145*	.1076*	-.0467	-.2109**	.0101	-.0607	1	.0924*	.0077	-.1027*	.1195**
15. Teaching Desire	.1427**	.1209**	.2052**	.0212	-.0152	.1016*	.0734	.3591**	.0306	-.1034*	-.2481**	.0562	-.0558	.0924*	1	.0213	-.0583	.1028*
16. Integration into Department	.0088	-.0335	.0683	-.0296	.0930*	.0523	.0583	.0376	.1418**	.0810	-.1795**	.1705**	.1269**	.0077	.0213	1	.2912**	.4929**
17. Quality of Students	.0948*	.0450	-.1931**	-.0073	-.0486	-.1168**	-.0853	-.1443**	.0523	.0284	.1563**	.0368	-.0648	-.1027*	-.0583	.2912**	1	.1665**
18. Sat. w/Teaching Support Fac.	.1202**	-.0550	.2619**	.0572	.1223**	.1249**	.1134*	.0837	.1048*	.0799	-.3294**	.0848	.0406	.1195**	.1028*	.4929**	.1665**	1

*p< .05, **p< .01
n = 504

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE II

Regression Coefficients

Predictors	Block 1	Block 2
Soft-Pure Disciplines	-.013/-.007	-.034/-.018
	(.09)	(.11)
Hard-Applied Disciplines	-.165/-.052	-.138/-.043
	(.15)	(.14)
Hard-Pure Disciplines	-.360/-.105**	-.477/-.161**
	(.16)	(.16)
Instruction Level - Graduate Courses	-.290/-.190**	-.183/-.119**
	(.08)	(.08)
Number of Courses Taught/Acad. Year	.196/ .253**	.170/ .219**
	(.04)	(.03)
Gender - Female		.246/ .158**
		(.07)
Minority Status - Non-Minority		.085/ .030
		(.13)
Artistic Moonlighters		.060/ .026
		(.11)
Semi-Retireds		.168/ .050
		(.15)
Hopeful Full-Timers		.106/ .045
		(.13)
Homeworkers		-.104/-.029
		(.18)
Graduate Students		-.410/-.108**
		(.18)
Integration into Department		.131/ .176**
		(.04)
Years of Service		.013/ .076**
		(.01)
Importance of Pay		-.005/-.003
		(.08)
Teaching Desire		.051/ .085**
		(.03)
Quality of Students		.081/.081*
		(.05)
Satisfaction w/Teaching Support Facilities		.071/ .085*
		(.05)
Multiple R	.34	.49
R^2	.11	.24
F	10.72**	5.24**

t is significant **p<.05; * p<.10.
Metric Coefficient/Standardized Coefficient (Standard Error of coefficient).

APPENDIX

Variable Definitions

Discipline Typologies:

Soft-Applied Disciplines: Accounting, Art, Economics, Education, Finance, Law, Management, Marketing, Music, Nursing, Public Service, Rehabilitation Services, School for New Learning (adult learning program), and Theatre. (n=335).

Soft-Pure Disciplines: Communication, English, History, Modern Languages, Philosophy, Political Science, Psychology, Religious Studies, Sociology, and Women's Studies. (n=90).

Hard-Applied Disciplines: Computer Science. (n=31).

Hard-Pure Disciplines: Biology, Chemistry, Math, and Physics. (n=23).

Occupational Typologies:

Semi-Retireds: Part-time faculty members who identified themselves as emeritus faculty. (n=26).

Graduate Students: Part-time faculty members who indicated that they were still in graduate school. (n=18).

Hopeful Full-Timers: Part-time faculty members who were not able to obtain a full-time teaching position. (n=59).

Full-Time Moonlighters: Part-time faculty who also do administrative jobs for their university, specified that they are employed full-time at another company, or specified that they are employed full-time at another university. (n=195).

Homeworkers: Part-time faculty members who stated that they were at home taking care of relatives while desiring to teach part-time only. (n=21).

Artistic Moonlighters: Part-time faculty members who indicated that they were involved in their respective artistic disciplines while also teaching. (n=71).

Importance of Pay:

If the instructor listed pay as one of the top three reasons for choosing to teach part-time, this variable was coded one. If pay was not specified in the top three reasons, the variable was coded zero.

APPENDIX

Variable Definitions

Teaching Desire:
This scale is derived from response means ranging from (1) very unlikely to (5) very likely. Alpha = .8040.

If you were to leave your part-time teaching position at this institution, how likely is it you would accept full time teaching employment at:

	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Doctoral-granting institution	3.08	1.54	.069
Other 4-year university or college	3.17	1.51	.067
2-Year college	2.22	1.31	.058

Quality of Students
This scale is derived from response means ranging from (1) poor to (5) excellent. Alpha = .8753.

	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Prerequisite skills for course	3.49	1.04	.046
Writing ability	3.02	1.05	.047
Preparation for class	3.26	1.11	.049
Conceptual/analytical ability	3.49	1.02	.045
Verbal communication skills	3.71	.962	.043
Intellectual curiosity	3.57	1.14	.051
Conscientiousness about course work	3.61	1.05	.047
Creative talents	3.48	.101	.045
Overall quality of students	3.70	.919	.041

Integration into the Department:
This scale is derived from response means ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. Alpha = .8454.

	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
The institution has supported my development as a teacher.	3.51	1.19	.053
I have regular contact with full-time members of the department.	3.10	1.45	.065
I have regular contact with other part-time members of the department.	2.74	1.39	.062
I have regular contact with the department chair..	3.08	1.43	.064
I feel a part of my department	3.19	1.33	.059
I am familiar with the overall curriculum for my department.	3.65	1.19	.053

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX

Variable Definitions

Satisfaction with the Teaching Support Facilities:
This scale is derived from response means ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. Alpha = .6861.

	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
I have sufficient clerical support for preparing class.	3.44	1.26	.056
Students are able to leave me messages.	3.86	1.09	.048
I have access to a photocopier.	3.99	1.12	.050
I am provided with office space for advising students and preparing for my courses.	3.15	1.39	.062

Satisfaction with the University:
This scale is derived from response means ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. Alpha = .7891.

	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
I feel well-treated at this institution.	3.60	1.03	.046
This institution is a good place to work as a part-time faculty member.	4.13	.912	.041
This institution has impressed me as a place committed to personalized service to the individual.	3.75	.972	.043

Developmental Advising:
This scale is derived from response means ranging from (1) never to (4) frequently. Alpha = .8107.

	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Advising on educational or career plans.	2.74	.927	.041
Advising on school work.	2.94	.955	.043
Advising on student research.	2.19	1.00	.045
Advising on personal matters.	2.19	.929	.041

References

Amemiya, T. 1980. "Selection of Regressors." *International Economic Review*, pp. 331-354.

Astin, A., Korn, W., and Green, K. 1987. "Retaining and Satisfying Students." *Educational Record* 68(1): 36-42.

Backhus, D. 1989. "centralized Intrusive Advising and Undergraduate Retention." *NACADA Journal* 9(1): 39-45.

Beal, P.E. and Noel, L. 1980. *What Works in Student Retention: The Report of a Joint Project of the American College Testing Program and the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems*. Iowa City: American College Testing Program and National Center for Higher Education Management Systems. ED 197 635. 142 pp. MF-01; PC-06.

Beasley-Fielstein, L. 1986. "Student Perceptions of the Developmental Adviser-Advisee Relationship." *NACADA Journal* 6(2): 107-17.

Bess, J.L. 1978. "Anticipatory Socialization of Graduate Students." *Research in Higher Education* 8: 289-317.

Biglan, A. 1973. "The Characteristics of Subject Matter in Different Academic Areas." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 57: 195-203.

Borgund, J.H. 1981. "Toward a Pragmatic Philosophy of Academic Advising." *NACADA Journal* 1(1): 1-6.

Boyer, E.L. 1987. *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America*. New York: Harper & Row.

Carberry, J.D., Baker, M. and Prescott, D.L. 1986. "Applying Cognitive Development Theory in the Advising Setting." *NACADA Journal* 6(2): 13-18.

Creswell, J.W., Seagren, A.T., and Henry, T.C. 1979. "Professional Development Training Needs of Department Chairpersons: A Test of the Biglan Model." *Planning and Changing* 10: 224-237.

Crookston, B.B. 1972. "A Developmental View of Academic Advising as Teaching." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 13: 12-17.

Ender, S.C., Winston, R.B., and Miller, T.K. 1982. "Academic Advising as Student Development." In *Developmental Approaches to Academic Advising*, edited by R.B. Winston, Jr., S.C. Ender, and T.K. Miller. New Directions for Student Services No. 17. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Frost, S.H. 1989b. "The Effects of Academic Advising and the Frequency of Faculty Contact on the Cognitive Development of College Freshmen." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Georgia.

Frost, S.H. 1989a. "Academic Responsibility: Can It Be Taught?" *NACADA Journal*. 9(2): 17-24.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Frost, S.H. 1990. "A Comparison of Developmental Advising at Two Small Colleges." *NACADA Journal* 10(2): 9-13.

Frost, S.H. 1991. *Academic Advising for Student Success: A System of Shared Responsibility.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 3. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

Gappa, J.M. "Employing Part-Time Faculty: Thoughtful Approaches to Continuing." *AAHE Bulletin*, October 1984, pp. 3-7.

Gappa, J.M., Leslie, D.W. 1993. *The Invisible Faculty: Improving the Status of Part-Timers in Higher Education.* Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gordon, V.N. 1988. "Developmental Advising." In *The Status and Future of Academic Advising: Problems and Promise*, edited by W.R. Habley. Iowa City: American College Testing Program.

Gordon, G. and Neumann, Y. 1979. "A Three-Facet Model for Scientific Development." *Public Administration Review* 39: 134-140.

Habley, W.R. 1981. "Academic Advisement: The Critical Link in Student Retention." *NASPA Journal* 18(4): 45-50.

Habley, W.R. 1988. "Introduction and Overview." In *The Status and Future of Academic Advising: Problems and Promise*, edited by W.R. Habley. Iowa City: American College Testing Program.

Lodahl, J.B. and Gordon, G. 1972. "The Structure of Scientific Fields and the Functioning of University Graduate Departments." *American Sociological Review* 37: 57-72.

Mahoney, F.A. 1982. "Guidance and Planning with Diversely Prepared Students." In *Diverse Student Populations: Benefits and Issues*, edited by Clark Taylor. New Directions for Experiential Learning No. 17. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mash, D.J. 1978. "Academic Advising: Too Often Taken for Granted." *College Board Review* 107: 33-36.

National Education Association. 1988. *Report and Recommendations on Part-Time, Temporary, and Nontenure Track Faculty Appointments.* Washington: NEA.

National Institute of Education. 1984. *Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: Author. ED 246 833. 127 pp. MF-01; PC-06.

Neumann, Y. 1979. "Three Approaches to Technology in Science and Their Organizational Correlates." *Technology Forecasting and Social Change* 15: 205-215.

Neumann, Y. and Finaly, E. 1988. "The Problem Solving Environment and Students' Problem Solving Orientation." *Research and Development in Education.*

Neumann, Y. and Finaly-Neumann, E. 1990. "The Reward-Support Framework and Faculty Commitment to Their University." *Research in Higher Education* 31: 75-97.

Neumann, Y. and Neumann, L. 1983. "Characteristics of Academic Areas and Students' Evaluation of Instruction." *Research in Higher Education* 19: 323-334.

Neumann, Y. and Neumann, L. 1984. "Equity Theory and Students' Commitment to Their University." *Research in Higher Education* 20: 269-280.

Okun, M.A., Kardash, C.A., Stock, W.A., Sandler, I.N., and Baumann, D.J. 1986. "Measuring Perceptions of the Quality of Academic Life Among College Students." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 27:447-51.

Park, R.E. 1966. "Estimation with Heteroscedastic Error Terms." *Econometrica*, p. 888.

Pascarella, E.T. 1980. "Student-Faculty Informal Contact and College Outcomes." *Review of Educational Research* 50: 545-95.

Pascarella, E.T. 1985. "College Environmental Influences on Learning and Cognitive Development." In *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, vol. 4, edited by J.C. Smart. New York: Agathon Press.

Pascarella, E.T. and Terenzini, P.T. 1978. "Student-Faculty Informal Relationships and Freshman Year Educational Outcomes." *Journal of Educational Research* 71: 183-89.

Pascarella, E.T. and Terenzini, P.T. 1980. "Predicting Freshman Persistence and Voluntary Drop-Out Decisions from a Theoretical Model." *Journal of Higher Education* 51: 60-75.

Pascarella, E.T. and Terenzini, P.T. 1981. "Residence Arrangement, Student/Faculty Relationships, and Freshman Year Educational Outcomes." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 22:147-56.

Pedhazur, E.J. 1982. *Multiple Regression in Behavioral Research.* Texas:Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc. pp. 174-183.

Ramsey, J.B. 1969. "Tests for Specification Errors in Classical Linear Least Squares Regression Analysis." *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, pp. 350-371.

Raskin, M. 1979. "Critical Issue: Faculty Advising.: *Peabody Journal of Education* 56: 99-108.

Sagaria, M.A.D., Higginson, L.C., and White, E.R. 1980. "Perceived Needs of Entering Freshman: The Primacy of Academic Issues." *Journal of College Student Personnel* 21: 243-47.

Shane, D. 1981. "Academic Advising in Higher Education: A Developmental Approach for College Students of All Ages." *NACADA Journal* 1(2): 12-23.

Stage, F.K. 1989. "Reciprocal Effects between the Academic and Social Integration of College Students." *Research in Higher Education* 30: 517:31.

Studenmund, A.H. 1992. *Using Econometrics: A Practical Guide*. New York: Harper Collins.

Terenzini, P.T., Pascarella, E.T., and Lorang, W.G. 1982. "An Assessment of the Academic and Social Influences on Freshman Year Educational Outcomes." *Review of Higher Education* %: 86-109.

Terenzini, P.T., Theophilides, C., and Lorang, W.G. 1984. "Influences on Students' Perceptions of their Academic Skill Development during College." *Journal of Higher Education* 55: 621-36.

Thomas, R.E., and Chickering, A.W. 1984. "Foundations for Academic Advising." In *Developmental Academic Advising: Addressing Students' Educational, Career, and Personal Needs*, edited by R.B. Winston, Jr., T.K. Miller, S.C. Ender, T.J. Grites, and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tinto, V. 1975. "Drop-out from Higher Education: A Theoretical Synthesis of Recent Research." *Review of Educational Research* 45: 89-125.

Trombley, T.B., and Holmes, D. 1981. "Defining the Role of Academic Advising in the Industrial Setting: The Next Phase." *NACADA Journal* 1(1): 1-8.

Tuckman, H.P., Vogler, W.D., and Caldwell, J. 1978. *Part-Time Faculty Series*. Washington: American Association of University Professors.

Walsh, R.W. 1981. "Changes in College Freshmen Following Participation in a Student Development Program." Ed.D. dissertation, Texas Technical University.

White, H. 1980. "A Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Covariance Matrix Estimator and a Direct Test for Heteroskedasticity." *Econometrica*, pp. 817-838.

Winston, R.B., Ender, S.C., and Miller, T.K., eds. 1982. *Developmental Approaches to Academic Advising*. New Directions for Student Services No. 17. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Winston, R.B., Ender, S.C., Miller, T.K., Grites, T.J., and Associates, eds. 1984. *Developmental Academic Advising: Addressing Students' Educational, Career, and Personal Needs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.